



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/662,414	09/14/2000	Kirk Beach	3730-915	9962
25096	7590	05/19/2005	EXAMINER ABDI, KAMBIZ	
PERKINS COIE LLP PATENT-SEA P.O. BOX 1247 SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247			ART UNIT 3621	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/662,414

Applicant(s)

BEACH ET AL.

Examiner

Kambiz Abdi

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

EA

Art Unit: 3621

DETAILED ACTION

1. The prior office actions are incorporated herein by reference. In particular, the observations with respect to claim language, and response to previously presented arguments.

- No claim has been amended.
- Claim 42 has been canceled.
- Claims 1-41 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 4 February 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As per arguments put forward by the applicant, examiner would like to address them as follows;

3. In response to the arguments to the validity of the 103(a) rejection of the claims both prior arts references of Burns (725) and Korman (536) clearly qualify as such. As both references clearly teach and disclose system and method of accepting coins, counting coins, and dispensing a valid voucher for later redemption. Which both have the motivation to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. That being the thrust of all the independent claims as well as the integral part of the alleged invention clearly qualifies both prior arts as having the teachings and disclosures, which makes the case to establish the *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore, the rejection of claims under 35 § U.S.C 103(a) is clearly permissible. One cannot just rely on the interpretation of the prior art on a selective manner to just take into account the portion, which is used to question the validity of the combination of the references. It is understood that reasonable interpretation has to be given in understanding of the claims.

4. Independent claims 1, 5, 13, 18, 20, 32, 37, 38, and 40 being substantially the same and similar, will be discussed together for the purpose of clarity and uniformity for compactness of the prosecution.

5. As for the fact that Burns can be an open or closed system, as it has been argued by the applicant, has no bearing on the claims in their current form, which they have been presented. Applicant is arguing features (i.e. Open system) or steps, which clearly have not been claimed in the claims.

Art Unit: 3621

6. As for Burns system being adopted for accepting coins or not and dispensing verifiable and redeemable vouchers, Burns clearly discloses such system in an alternative embodiment (See Burns column 4, lines 39-55 and column 7, lines 50-58). Therefore, the applicant is in error asserting that Burns reference does not disclose the collection of coins and dispensing a redeemable voucher that can be presented for cash or credit at other terminals (cashiers, slot machines, or ATM).

7. In regards to the argument put forward by the applicant in regards to the first communication link to the back room and the second communication link to the token database, again they are persuasive as will be discussed below.

8. Applicant has argued that neither Burns or Korman disclose or fairly suggest the use of multiple communication links in order to verify the validity of the voucher. However, as it is disclosed in the specification and in the arguments the cashiers' station has communication with the back room computer as the first communication in order to communicate information relevant to the business of the location of the cashier, such as a grocery store, or a gas station, or a bank. Which the cashier or any other similar functioning terminal would use this communication to access information related to the business of the establishment such as price, accounts or any other information. Although the second communication link is used to contact the token database and retrieve information for verifying the validity of a voucher. Examiner references to the sighted passages within the prior arts of reference are clear on usage of the first and second communication links. Examiner would like to expand on this point, that each of the presentation points for the voucher to be verified and validated before redemption is by itself a separate system with its own back room computer for in store processing. This would be system such as the ATM/POS station connected to a bank or a grocery stores computer or network of them as well as Airline reservation systems. Korman clearly discloses such system that a voucher could be used at an ATM/POS as it is clearly disclosed by the Burns system as well. For example, voucher would have a first communication link to the bank back room computer system that is specific to banking operation and a second communication link to the ATM/POS system to the token database for the voucher recognition.

Art Unit: 3621

9. Therefore, as is has been discussed above the arguments by the applicant is not persuasive and the prior rejection as it was presented in the office action mailed on 4 October 2004, has been maintained. Applicant is encouraged to contact the examiner if there are any further clarifications or assistance examiner can provide.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claim1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,736,725 to James G. Burns in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,318,536 to Bruce R. Korman.

12. As for claims 1, 3-4, 13, 14-17, 20, 23, 32, 37, 38, 40 and 42, Burns clearly teaches a system and method for verifying a voucher or token, comprising;

- means for recording a code associated with the voucher (cash out slips with bar code) or token (See Burns column 2, lines 55-63 and column 6, lines 48-68);
- a voucher or token database which stores at least one of a code and a value associated with the voucher or token (See Burns column 2, lines 55-63, and column 6, lines 48-68);
- means for scanning the voucher or token to retrieve the code at a cashier's station (See Burns column 7, lines 50-58);

Art Unit: 3621

- means for querying a voucher or token database for information associated with the code (See Burns column 6, line 55-column 7, line 68);
- verifying the value associated with the voucher or token (See Burns column 6, lines 55-63).
- means for determining whether the voucher or token is valid (See Burns column 6, line 55-column 7, line 68),
- the code associated with a voucher or token is unique (See Burns column 6, lines 48-63),

What is not explicitly thought by Burns is the direct communication link (Second communication link) with either host computer centrally located (central processing unit or back room computer) in communication with the kiosk or directly communicating with kiosk (second (direct) communication link with Slot Machine) for the voucher validation.

However, Korman clearly teaches the use of direct (second communication link) or indirect (first communication link) communication via multiple communications method to the central processing unit or the kiosk for the purpose of validating a redeemable voucher at a terminal (See Korman column 9, lines 29-30, column 7, line 59- column 8, line 3, column 9, lines 39-42, column 10, lines 16-18, and column 10, line 65-column 11, line 4). It is clear that one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to modify any type of communication (using POTS or PSTN, ISDN, DSL Modem, TCP/IP, RS-232 Serial connection, Wireless RF Modem, a cellular modem, or satellite connection) to be used to communicate between a point of sale terminal (POS) and the issuing kiosk directly or via a centrally located computer that all or many of kiosks are connected thereto to verify the validity of the presented voucher to the POS (slot machine or cashier's station).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to use the alternative methods of communications thought by Korman to communicate with the validating authority to validate a voucher for the motivation of direct communication between the POS and the validating system (kiosk or the central processing unit) to achieve more accurate transactions as well as reduction on the need for a local processing unit to store the needed information.

Art Unit: 3621

13. As for claims 2 and 21, Burns clearly teaches all the limitations of claims 1 and 20, further;

Burns teaches,

- providing a coin counting mechanism which is configured to receive, all at once, a plurality of randomly oriented coins of multiple denominations and other objects, discriminate the coins and output the voucher or token for an amount related to the value of the coins (See Burns column 7, lines 50-58).

14. As for claims 3, 22, and 39, Burn clearly teaches all the limitations of claims 1, 20, and 38 further;

Burns teaches,

- the scanning step is performed with a recognition subsystem (See Burns column 2, lines 55-68 and column 3, lines 24-30).

15. As for claims 5 and 24, Burn clearly teaches all the limitations of claims 1 and 20, further; Burns

teaches,

- the querying step includes querying a kiosk which includes at least a portion of the voucher or token database (See column 2, lines 55-66, column 6, lines 48-55, and column 8, lines 11-17)

16. As for claims 6 and 25, Burn clearly teaches all the limitations of claims 5 and 24, further; Burns

teaches,

- the recording step is performed in a remote location from the kiosk (See Burns column 3, lines 33-50 and column 4, lines 39-53).

17. As for claims 7 and 26, Burn clearly teaches all the limitations of claims 1 and 20, further; Burns

teaches,

- the querying step includes querying a control center which includes at least a portion of the voucher or token database (See Burns column 6, lines 48-63).

Art Unit: 3621

18. As for claims 8 and 27, Burn clearly teaches all the limitations of claims 1 and 20, further; Burns teaches,

- the querying step is performed by a recognition subsystem (See Burns column 3, lines 38-41).

19. As for claims 9 and 28, Burn clearly teaches all the limitations of claims 1 and 20, further; Burns teaches,

- the querying step is performed by a recognition subsystem the voucher or token includes at least one of a magnetic strip, a bar code or a smart card (See column 6, lines 5-16 and column 8, lines 23-28).

20. As for claims 10 and 29, Burn clearly teaches all the limitations of claims 1 and 20, further; What Burns is not explicit on,

- the voucher or token is at least one of a phone card, a gift certificate, a mass transit pass, a travel ticket, a financial instrument and an event ticket.

However, Korman is clearly teaches the total value can be used for multiple transactions such as event tickets or airline tickets (See Korman column 2, lines 51-64).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to combine the teachings of the Burns and Korman for the motivation of further the transaction utility of the system of the burns.

21. As for claims 11 and 30, Burn clearly teaches all the limitations of claims 1 and 20, further; Burns teaches,

- printing the voucher or token (See Burns column 3, lines 37-41 and column 4, lines 39-53).

Art Unit: 3621

22. As for claims 12, 18, 31, and 41 Burn clearly teaches all the limitations of claims 1, 13, 20, and 40, further; Burns teaches,

- counting coins with a coin counting mechanism in a kiosk, wherein at least a part of the database is located in the kiosk (See Burns column 7, lines 50-58 and column 8, lines 9-17).

23. As for claim 19, Burn clearly teaches all the limitations of claims 113, further; Burns teaches, the system is not coupled to a point of sale system (See Burns column 7, lines 50-58)

24. As for claim 33, Burns clearly teaches all the limitations of claim 32, further;

What Burns does not explicitly teach that the code contains at least a modem number of an issuing kiosk (See Burns column 6, lines 34-38). Burns clearly teaches the utility of the bar code including number of information within the code. Additionally Korman clearly teaches the use of modem for communication and it would be essential to have some kind of identifier (telephone number or ISDN Number) for linking the two parties on each side of the modem communication in order to connect to the specific party.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to have a number included within the bar code for ease and convenient of locating and communicating with the specific kiosk for retrieving information for validating the value voucher.

25. As for claim 34, Burns clearly teaches all the limitations of claim 32, further; Burns teaches,

- the code is related to at least one of a printed voucher or token or a preexisting card (See Burns column 6, lines 48-55).

26. As for claim 35, Burns clearly teaches all the limitations of claim 32, further; Burns teaches,

Art Unit: 3621

- recording a residual value associated with the code after the redeeming step (See Burns column 4, lines 46-49)
27. As for claim 36, Burns clearly teaches all the limitations of claim 32, further; Burns teaches,
- the reading step is performed with at least one of a card reader, a smartcard reader and a bar code scanner (See Burns column 2, lines 63-65, column 3, lines 24-27).
28. Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior arts of record in the body of this action for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the response, to consider fully the entire references as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior arts or disclosed by the examiner.

Conclusion

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Kambiz Abdi** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-6702**. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, **James Trammell** can be reached at **(571) 272-6712**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see

<http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 3621

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231**

or faxed to:

(703) 305-7687 [Official communications; including After Final communications labeled "Box AF"]

(703) 308-1396 [Informal/Draft communications, labeled "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the Examiner in the

Knox Building, 50 Dulany St. Alexandria, VA.

Kambiz Abdi
Examiner

May 11, 2005

JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600